DATE: August 26, 2021

TO: All Potential Vendors

FROM: Michael Callahan, RFP Coordinator

SUBJECT: Amendment #4 to 22-RFP-033 – *Enterprise Cloud Computing Implementation Support Services*

**Summary:**

This document is prepared by the Washington State Consolidated Technology Services (CTS) and shall serve as the sole official reply to Vendor Questions submitted in response to RFP 22-RFP-033.

Questions and responses are numbered for ease of reference only and are in no particular order or priority. Questions and comments have generally been stated as they were received except that some questions have been modified to maintain vendor confidentiality or to reduce redundancies. The answers may only explain or clarify some aspect that is already addressed in the RFP. Some of the answers may also supplement or change what was previously stated in the RFP or in an appendix. It is important that Vendors review all questions and answers. Vendors are advised to obtain and thoroughly review the complete, formal RFP located at: <http://watech.wa.gov/procurement-announcements>. In the revised RFP deleted text appears ~~struck through in black font~~, while added text appears underlined in red font.

**V****endor Questions and Official Answers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | **QUESTION** | **CTS RESPONSE** |
| 1 | Please confirm if a company can submit a proposal as a prime vendor while being a subcontractor for another vendor? | Yes, this is permissible. |
| 2 | Is this single or multiple award contract? | One contract will be awarded as a result of this RFP (See Section 1.3 *Business Objective*). There is an error in Section 7.9 *Selection of Apparently Successful Vendors.* This section is amended. Please see the amended RFP released with this amendment. |
| 3 | Is this a new RFP or any incumbent currently providing the services?, if yes please could you share the details? | There is no incumbent providing these services. |
| 4 | Can the vendor assume that CTS will use Active Directory for Identity Management, Authentication and Authorization purposes? | Identity management is one of the adjacent workstreams listed under 1.4.5. It will be driven by other CTS organization. Current policy requires identities used for state applications to be sourced from the Enterprise Active Directory managed by CTS. |
| 5 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.2 - Background,] please confirm if private cloud is desired as a feasible cloud deployment option? | CTS anticipates Washington State Cloud (private cloud) will continue to be offered as a shared services, this could be one of the feasible cloud deployment options |
| 6 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3 - Business Objective, Page 5,] does CTS have change management, marketing, communication and training teams within WaTech or are other state teams/systems leveraged? | Organization change management and workforce development are two separate workstreams not in the direct scope of this RFP but related workstreams which will be driven by other CTS/Agency owners – see ECC program sequence of projects in 1.4.7. We expect the vendor of this RFP could collaborate with those related owners as needed. |
| 7 | Regarding RFP Section 1.3 - Business Objective, Page 5] does the ECC have access to a centralized communication platform for CTS and other agencies? | Yes, ECC could leverage the standard communication channels of WaTech/CTS. |
| 8 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3 - Business Objective, Page 5,] does CTS or ECC have a Prosci certified advanced instructor on staff (PCAI)? | ECC does not have Prosci certified staff right now, and organization change management workstream will be driven by other CTS/Agency owners later. We expect the vendor of this RFP could collaborate with those related team as needed. |
| 9 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4.2 - Cloud Management Tools, Page 8,] please clarify if at this stage and scope of the bid if the vendor should include specifics of the tools, licensing and/or any support or costs? | 1.4.2 page 8 describes the long-term scope of the ECC program regarding cloud management tools. 1.5.1.b describes the immediate deliverables in the initial SOW. Tools specific licensing and implementation cost for 1.4.2 are not included in the initial SOW; tools required to accomplish the deliverables described in section 1.5.1 should be included bidder's pricing response. |
| 10 | [Regarding RPF Section 1.4.3 - Cloud Ready Operations Tools, Page 10,] will CTS serve as the central security, compliance & regulatory oversight for all agencies in the public cloud? | Cybersecurity is one of the adjacent workstreams listed under 1.4.5. It will be driven by the state office of Cybersecurity, we expect the vendor of this RFP would collaborate with related owners as needed. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 11 | [Regarding Reference to Deferred Application Inventory discussed at the Pre-Response Conference,] one of the slides presented indicated that the application inventory had been deferred. Can you please elaborate as to which scope of the program this item refers? | Application and cloud service inventory are kept under 1.4.2 and 1.4.4 regarding long term scope of the ECC program. It is deferred from the 1.5.1 initial SOW to focus on the immediate needs of the ECC program. |
| 12 | [Regarding Reference to Deferred Application Inventory discussed at the Pre-Response Conference,] for detailed migration wave planning, is the vendor required to compile the list of applications in the application inventory? | We have an existing application inventory done by Unisys before, plus annual report of applications from agencies. We are expecting vendor of this RFP to leverage those existing data and report to plan the migration, we could ask for more specific information as needed but doing another round of application inventory is not in the scope of the initial SOW. |
| 13 | What IT industry certifications (if any) are required of assigned cloud computing personnel? | Cloud related certifications are desired but not required. This could include certifications from major cloud service providers such as AWS, Microsoft and Google. |
| 14 | What cloud management portals does WaTech and/or State Agencies utilize currently? | There is no centralized cloud management platform currently. State agencies use a variety of platforms and portals. |
| 15 | What cloud platforms are present workloads hosted on? | State agencies use a variety of cloud platforms currently. Available details are provided in Appendix G. |
| 16 | What are State of Washington’s current data retention, compliance, and backup policies? | Given the breadth of the Enterprise, applications have a variety of data retention, compliance, and backup policies in scope for this effort. |
| 17 | Is there an inventory report of the 9,000 servers (Windows / Linux servers, OS versions/distros, physical/cloud provider, role) that can be shared? | Appendix G provides the information on the current assets that is available at this time. |
| 18 | [**Question Part 1**] Does State of WA already have a preferred list of applications for modernization and migration?  [**Question Part 2**] [Please state [how] this align[s] with the Themes "Application migrations are not in the initial SOW" during the Pre-bid Conference?] | No, we do not have a preferred migration list.  We are expecting the vendor to focus on building the ECC program structure and migration planning in the initial SOW as stated in 1.5.1; instead of focus on specific migration projects in this initial stage. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 19 | [Regarding Cloud Migration,] we understand that the State did a Cloud Readiness Assessment. As part of that assessment, did you conduct application infrastructure mapping for 3300 applications; could this information be made available to us? | No, an application infrastructure mapping has not been completed. |
| 20 | [Regarding Cloud Migration,] to automate discovery of current state, we would need to implement our discovery tools in your environment. Given this, are there any security limitations to deploying tools to support this work? | All discovery tools will need to go through standard security reviews before deployment. |
| 21 | [Regarding Cloud Management Tools,] what is your current CMDB, asset management, configuration and finance management tools, for example, ServiceNow, Flexera? | From the note in section 1.4.2: There is no centralized configuration management database deployed for the state’s assets. Bidders should assume tools described will not require integration or synchronization with existing tools. |
| 22 | [Regarding Program Scope,] are you open to an offshore delivery model? If activities don’t require any data access, can these be performed from offshore locations? | There are no restrictions on vendor location. However, there are restrictions on data location (see OCIO Policy 141.10) |
| 23 | [Regarding Cloud Management Tools,] do you already have DevOps / IAC tools in place? If yes, please provide details about these tools. | Given the breadth of the Enterprise, agencies utilize a variety of DevOps tools. Details are not available. |
| 24 | [Regarding Cloud Service Broker,] do you already have DevOps / IAC tools in place? If yes, please provide details about these tools. | Given the breadth of the Enterprise, agencies utilize a variety of DevOps tools. Details are not available. |
| 25 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4.7 - Cloud Migration,Page 14,] in the Program Timeline graphic, Application Inventory work is mentioned as Out of scope. However, Section 1.4.4 Cloud Migration projects indicates Inventory Applications as a key activity. Please clarify. | Application inventory is kept under 1.4.4 for long term scope of the ECC program. It is deferred or out of scope for the initial SOW as described in 1.5.1. |
| 26 | Section 1.4.8 of the RFP specifies tasks that may need to be performed on site. Please elaborate on the list of tasks or the percentage level of effort. | This is indeterminable at this time. However, throughout the engagement, Vendor is likely required to be onsite in Olympia, WA. |
| 27 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] to what extent have you defined your service level or operating level agreements which will need to be adhered to with the agencies and end clients that influence the cloud coe, architecture and designs? | Service level and operating agreements for the ECC have not been established. |
| 28 | Is the ASV precluded from bidding on any software procurement RFP that is generated based on the work performed in this RFP? | Possibly. However, whether there is a conflict will have to be determined on a case-by-case basis depending on what is being procured. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 29 | Can you describe the level of detail expected to be undertaken to prepare for the pilots in phase 2? Do you expect detailed plans at the end of this project phase or merely to have agencies and workloads identified as candidates for pilot migration? | The migration guidance and roadmap will be higher priority for the vendor to deliver first. Based on the guidance, there are potentially different ways to identify those pilot projects and these pilot projects could start before the end of initial SOW. |
| 30 | [Regarding Pre-Response Conference,] it was stated that application migration activity will require significant effort and planning and is out of scope for this RFP, however the RFP still states that the vendor should provide a triage of workloads, identify quick wins, a five year migration plan including migration waves, etc. Can you please clarify what level of effort supporting migration activity is in scope for this RFP? | Deliverable 1.5.1.c asks for a migration roadmap, including an approach to migration planning in waves within the initial SOW. Other activity - including an application triage and application migration - is in scope for the procurement but not included in the initial SOW. Level of effort for application migration is to be determined. |
| 31 | Will the original data of the Unisys report be made available for analysis? This would include the interview questions, responses, and any raw data collected and correlated by agency. | Appendix G provides the information available at this time. The Cloud Assessment can be found at https://ocio.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/Reports/Unisys%20Deliverable%203%20Statewide%20Cloud%20Computing%20Readiness%20Assessment-FINAL-103020.pdf?ka4pfb. The OCIO Cloud Report can be found at https://ocio.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/Reports/Cloud%20Readiness%20Report.pdf?ka4pfb |
| 32 | Would you consider recommendations on building an org structure where the WaTech acts as the payer and broker for all agencies, in exchange for financial efficiencies and operations optimization? | From section 1.4.6: Centralized Cloud procurement on behalf of the state is not expected for the ECC nor within this procurement. |
| 33 | [Regarding RFP Sec. 1.5.1 – Deliverables in Initial Statement of Work,] does "constituents" refer to citizens of the State or to the constituent agencies of the State of Washington? | Within the community described, constituents would reference agency leadership, legislative representatives, employees, and the like. "Constituents" in this community of practice context would not include residents of the State. |
| 34 | [Regarding RPF Sec. 1.4.2 – Cloud Management Tools,] should such tools already exist in the WaTech or Agency environment, will leveraging them become the preferred option? | From the note in section 1.4.2: There is no centralized configuration management database deployed for the state’s assets. Bidders should assume tools described will not require integration or synchronization with existing tools. |
| 35 | [Regarding RFP Sec. 1.4.4 – Triage,] is this the fundamental criteria for performing Pilot Planning? Will these applications be expected to be migrated by the chosen Vendor as part of the Establish Program/Phase 1? | CTS anticipates the pilot projects would represent quick wins to demonstrate the initial capabilities of the ECC and accelerate applications ready for cloud migration. CTS is looking to bidders to inform criteria. Application migration is outside the scope of the initial SOW, and the level of effort to support migrations by CTS and/or the selected vendor is to be determined. |
| 36 | [Regarding RFP Sec. 1.4.4 – Cloud Migration Projects Proof of Concepts,] will the chosen Vendor be performing the actual migration of Pilot applications to cloud or will they only play a guidance role? | Level of effort for application migration and scope of services provided by agencies, CTS and/or the vendor is to be determined. |
| 37 | [Regarding RFP Sec. 1.5.1-c-I – Preparing for Cloud Ready Operations,] this looks like an application migration assessment and dependency mapping exercise. Would such an assement be performed at the agency level, or datacenter wide? | 1.5.1.c.i establishes the migration plan and roadmap and will be at the Enterprise level. |
| 38 | [Regarding RFP Sec. 1.5.1.c – Identification of applications in priority wave,] will the Cursory Analysis report be expected to represent the basis of App Migration Planning or will new deep dive interviews with the Agency staff best o1.5.2n Vendor identified methodology and best practices be appropriate as part of this RFP? | CTS looks to vendor-identified methodologies and best practices to inform how best to accomplish deliverable 1.5.1.c.i. |
| 39 | [Regarding RFP Sec. 1.5.1.d – Planning and preparation of Pilot Projects,] based on the application's architecture, planning deep dive sessions can sometimes include even application code analysis. Does planning include detailed future state architectures or just a broader categorization of the migration type for the pilot candidate applications? | CTS anticipates the pilot projects would represent quick wins to demonstrate the initial capabilities of the ECC and accelerate applications ready for cloud migration. Application code analysis is not in scope for the initial SOW. |
| 40 | [Regarding RFP Sec. 1.5.2 – Enterprise Architecture Design,] to what extent are the current Enterprise Architecture practices and standards expected to influence the future state of the Cloud and the applications being migrated (beyond governance and security posture)? | Current and new Enterprise Architecture will inform, guide, and standardize application solutions, including cloud topologies. Expected areas of influence include governance, security, identity and authorization, data management, and interface design. |
| 41 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.1,] how well documented is the current environment for applications and supporting infrastructure? | Appendix G provides the information on the current assets that is available at this time. |
| 42 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.2,] what additional details can be shared around how each of the identified projects were scoped and costed? | The full Cloud Assessment can be found at https://ocio.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/Reports/Unisys%20Deliverable%203%20Statewide%20Cloud%20Computing%20Readiness%20Assessment-FINAL-103020.pdf?ka4pfb. This report includes the available additional details. |
| 43 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.2,] what is the high level breakdown of servers/storage/database by OS versions, MW versions, DB versions so that we have a sense of how much legacy is in the environment? | Appendix G provides the information on the current assets that is available at this time. |
| 44 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.2,] what are the 79 government agencies in scope of the program? | The ECC will focus on Executive branch agencies excluding higher education, including the 79 represented in the Unisys assessment: https://www.governor.wa.gov/boards-commissions/board-and-commissions/board-commission-profiles |
| 45 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.2,] what is the high level mapping of applications and technologies in scope by Agencies and their complexity? | Appendix G provides the information on the current assets that is available at this time. |
| 46 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3,] what is your philosophy regarding modifying your processes to fit the cloud solution versus modifying the solution to fit your current processes? | Given the breadth of the Enterprise, agencies take a variety of approaches for application roadmaps - to include both modification of solutions and modification of processes. Our intent is to adopt industry best practices, and we realize both tools and processes are impacted. |
| 47 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3,] can you generally describe your controls, risks and associated processes (E.g. CyberSecurity)? | Given the breadth of the Enterprise, a variety of controls, policies, and processes are in place. Information can be referenced at https://ocio.wa.gov/policies. |
| 48 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3,] how will the program be expected to interface with and support audits including the Internal Audit teams? | Answer will be addressed in subsequent amendment. |
| 49 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3.2,] what are the tools currently used for configuration management on premises and intended for the public cloud? | From the note in section 1.4.2: There is no centralized configuration management database deployed for the state’s assets. Bidders should assume tools described will not require integration or synchronization with existing tools. |
| 50 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3.2,] what is your current approach to sourcing cloud services from a single vs multiple CSPs? | Given the breadth of the Enterprise, a vareity of cloud topologies are in use. Agencies procure cloud services for their application needs. |
| 51 | [**Question Part 1]** [Regarding RFP Section 1.3.5,] how flexible is the 5-year time frame for program completion and can it be adjusted to less than a 5-year time frame?  **[Question Part 2]** Are there any incentives for a shorter time frame? | CTS does not anticipate the migration of the Enterprise could be accomplished in less than 5 years and is not prepared to provide incentives to accelerate the full scope of activities. |
| 52 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] to what extent will the scope of detailed analysis include suggesting application rationalization, modernization with new set of applications/SaaS to replace existing applications? | We would defer to the bidders and expertise of the vendor community to inform this question. CTS does not have a current methodology or analytical approach requiring integration by bidders. |
| 53 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] what is the expected disposition and complexity of applications that are mapped to rehost, replatform, retain, retire and others | This analysis has not been performed. The available information on existing applications is provided in Appendix G. |
| 54 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] what is State of Washington primary virtualization platform within the data centers (e.g. VMware ESXi, Hyper-V)? | A variety of virtualization platforms are in use within CTS and across the Enterprise currently, including those referenced in the question. |
| 55 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] what percentage of your application portfolio is virtualized by breakdown for e.g. VMware, HyperV? | Appendix G provides the information on the current assets that is available at this time. Only a small percentage of the current application portfolio is virtualized as described |
| 56 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] what is the storage/size for the approximately 9,000 servers which are anticipated to move? | Appendix G provides the information on the current assets that is available at this time. Storage details are not known at this time. |
| 57 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] what is the current cloud presence with any of the major providers currently? | State agencies use a variety of cloud platforms currently. Available details are provided in Appendix G. |
| 58 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] what is WATech high level network design to facilitate proposed connectivity? | Given the scope of the Enterprise, CTS anticipates a number of connectivity options to be leveraged - private transport, Internet transport, and otherwise. |
| 59 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] are we integrating with and/or migrating any data warehouses/lakes/big data? | Given the scope of the Enterprise, CTS anticipates data warehouses will be included in the existing inventory to some degree. |
| 60 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] how many third-party integrations exist which need to be factored into architectures? | Current integration details are not known. |
| 61 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] are there any existing ITSM, configuration management, PMO or other tools the supplier will need to leverage and/or integrate with as part of the effort? | From the note in section 1.4.2: There is no centralized configuration management database deployed for the state’s assets. Bidders should assume tools described will not require integration or synchronization with existing tools. |
| 62 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] will the supplier need to integrate with any other government agencies within the state, other state and federal agencies? | Given the scope of the Enterprise, integration with other entities is expected for some applications, but the scope of the ECC does not have requirements for integration outside of Washington State at this time. |
| 63 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] do you have any preferred system integrator or existing vendors which supplier will be required to work with for this effort? | No, CTS does not have an established system integrator for this effort. |
| 64 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] at a high level what is the breakdown of how many end users and their priorities for in scope systems will there be on average daily/monthly/yearly that influence the decisions | This information is not available. The information we have available on applications and systems in scope is provided in Appendix G. |
| 65 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] what are your BC/DR requirements? Is BC/DR a requirement? Have applications been tiered by RPO/RTO? | Backup and disaster recovery use cases are in scope for the Enterprise. Requirements have not been captured nor have applications been tiered by performance expectation. |
| 66 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4,] to what extent is connectivity and configuration to the cloud provider(s) in scope as part of this effort? | Network requirements and configuration are an adjacent workstream outside the scope of the initial SOW but are in scope for the ECC program and may be addressed in subsequent SOWs. |
| 67 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4.2,] how is the supplier responsible for monitoring and modeling financials with respect to budget/TCO tracking and integration with the CTS team? | Answer will be addressed in Subsequent amendment. |
| 68 | Regarding RFP Sectio m1.4.2,] how do you anticipate the Enterprise Architecture function will participate to the program? | Enterprise Architecture design is identified as a primary CTS responsibility in the table within seciton 1.5.2. The Enterprise Architecture team within CTS will participate as needed, including leadership of the Identity workstream. |
| 69 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4.2,] what are the limitations if any to leveraging offshore or non-domestic supplier resources? | Please see answer to Question #26. |
| 70 | Regarding RFP Section 1.5,] to what extent will the supplier need to enter into any contractual agreements with other 3rd parties or will contracts exit between WATech and the 3rd parties? | Please See Section 5.2.3 *Tools* and Section C *Miscellaneous Pricing* of Appendix E *Cost Proposal Worksheet.* |
| 71 | With which cloud providers does the State currently have contracts? Will any of the existing contracts require renegotiations? | Multiple cloud providers are listed on state contracts. Contract negotiation for these contracts is outside the scope of this procurement. |
| 72 | Are there existing WaTech Technology specification templates (Blueprints, Landing Zones etc.) that can be leveraged? Are there existing findings that can be shared from other recent cloud migrations beyond the Unisys reports, to include in the target-state solution? | CTS does not have templates established for cloud environments at this time, nor is there an existing community of practice or other forum by which findings from other migrations could be sourced. |
| 73 | Please confirm the number of agencies that are in-scope, as identified in the RFP. | The ECC will focus on Executive branch agencies excluding higher education: https://www.governor.wa.gov/boards-commissions/board-and-commissions/board-commission-profiles |
| 74 | What is the expected % participation of the various agencies and departments in this program? Can agencies opt out of the program? What controls are in place to require agency participation for the Cloud migration initiative? | At this time, no policies or controls are in place to require agency participation. The expected participation will be determined by the value delivered by the program. |
| 75 | How many WaTech and agency resources will be allocated to support this initiative? Of these resources what (%) of their time will be dedicated to the program? What are their specific skillsets? | The ECC will be led by a manager and initially staffed with two team members dedicated to this program. Their skills will include architecture as well as cloud enablement and migration. This procurement is to augment the capacity and skill set of these resources to execute the program. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 76 | What % confidence does WaTech have in the Unisys findings in terms of Completeness (technology footprint, skills assessment etc.), Accuracy (reliability of source data, assumptions, data models etc.), and Cost Estimates (project charters, scope, staffing, timelines, assumptions etc.)? Are there specific areas that will require further validation or reassessment? | The initial report is described as a cursory analysis. This procurement anticipates a more thorough analysis will be required and defines the deliverables as such. |
| 77 | What is the overall agency adoption rate (%) of new systems introduced over the past 5 years? What is the State track record (%) of on time, on budget for large scale systems implementations? | These statistics are not readily available, though status of IT projects can be found on the OCIO dashboard https://wacioportal.force.com and available metrics can be researched at https://ocio.wa.gov/performance-metrics |
| 78 | Can you describe the decision-making oversight and processes envisioned for this initiative? | The current program is governed by a steering committee which includes sponsors and agency representatives for strategic decisions and consultation. Tactical and operational decisions will be made by the ECC Manager with best practice consultation from the vendor. As described in the procurement, CTS does anticipate a governance structure for managing cloud architecture, standards, and integration. |
| 79 | In the desired target-state, what IT services will be delivered through statewide shared services? What IT services will be managed and delivered at the Agency and/or Department level? What are the key criteria or considerations for determining what services are included in the statewide shared service? | The desired target-state has not been defined at this level. CTS anticipates identity management, security, network connectivity, and Washington State Cloud (private cloud) will continue to offered as shared services. The criteria for determining what services are included in a shared service will be informed by the enterprise and cloud architecture activities and driven by value to agencies and the enterprise in whole. |
| 80 | The Washington State Cloud Readiness Report indicates that HCA and DOH have already gone 'all-in' on cloud. a. What % of their applications are already in a public cloud? And what platform? b. Are there any unresolved challenges? | The references and appendices for the procurement provided what is known at this time in terms of current state and progress. The objectives and goals of this procurement and the ECC program are to capture what went well, identify unsolved challenges, and deliver solutions. Thus, we have defined deliverables in 1.5.1 to continue on this journey. |
| 81 | Is the implementation of cloud services in-scope? Per the diagram it appears to be out of scope, but per the RFP language is still in-scope. Please clarify? | Implementation of cloud services is out of scope for the initial SOW but in scope for the ECC. The level of support need for implementation services is to be determined. |
| 82 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.4.7, page 13,] is there an expectation to complete the Migration Roadmap without the Application inventory? Section 1.4.4 seems to indicate that the Application inventory might still be in-scope. Please clarify. | An application inventory is still anticipated to be in scope but pushed out of the initial Statement of Work. Deliverable 1.5.1.c.i captures the ask for a five-year migration plan and roadmap to be included in the initial SOW. |
| 83 | What is the expectation for the Pilot? Is there a requirement to actually move workloads as a part of the pilot? Please clarify. | Please reference the description of deliverable 1.5.1.d as to what is included in scope for the planned initial SOW. |
| 84 | **[Question Part 1]** What are the common cloud platform services used by most Washington State Agencies? Examples of common cloud platform services we have seen at other State’s include identity, workflow, and document management. Please list the common cloud platform services that support business requirements and/or business capabilities for most Washington State Agencies or indicate that this analysis has not been performed in your response. **[Question Part 2]** Will the pilot include application refactoring to utilize the common cloud platform services (software) listed in [the] question above? Does the State of Washington anticipate deprecating legacy application functionality as they eventually migrate to cloud platform services? | Part 1: This analysis has not been performed. Expected platform services are defined in the procurement and include security, identity, inventory and financial management tools, and connectivity. Part 2: The scope of the pilots are yet to be determined, as is the impact on applications with cloud migration. |
| 85 | Is there a target state application architecture that describes the core application services including the enterprise services bus, level of service isolation, and methods for service invocation? | No, not yet. |
| 86 | What elements of the target state enterprise application architecture will remain on-premise and conversely what will be migrated to the cloud? | Elements to remain on premise or within the state data center have not been determined at this time. |
| 87 | [**Question Part 1**] How will the Cloud Services Broker and the Cloud Center of Excellence incorporate agencies with existing cloud environments and migration initiatives underway?  [**Question Part 2**] What will be the timeline and expectations to integrate these existing cloud environments with the state virtual data center design and governance? | Part 1: Incorporation of existing cloud environments and in-process initiatives is to be determined. Current solutions have been reviewed through security design reviews and currently available guidance and policy.  Part 2: Given the anticipated multi-tenancy, multi-cloud solutions needed to solve the needs of the Enterprise, impact on current environments that conform to identity and security policies should be minimal. Timeframes and expectations to address any impacts are unknown at this time. |
| 88 | Would it be allowable to respond to this RFO as a fixed-fee, deliverable based project? This would allow CTS to know the outcome they will receive without the worry of hours being used and objectives not being met. The work requested in this RFO would be bid and executed for a fixed price, with regular payments being provided upon reaching agreed-upon payment milestones. We perform all of our projects this way, including many successful cloud deployments with State of Washington departments. Is this model acceptable for this RFO? | Given subsequent SOWs are anticipated, CTS anticipates the contract to include hourly rates by resource. Specific SOWs could be deliverables-based or hourly. |
| 89 | Are there specific Cloud Vend[o]rs that should be included in the Multi-Cloud approach (i.e., Azure, AWS)? | No. Given the nature of the Washington Enterprise and the variety and scale of applications to be addressed, CTS is expecting a variety of solutions to be leveraged to solve the state's cloud needs. |
| 90 | [Regarding Paragraph 4.5 of Appendix B of the Proposed Contract – the proposed language] could result in a breach of our GSA schedule. Can the language be changed to: "With the exception of Vendor’s Federal GSA Schedule pricing, Vendor agrees that all the Prices, terms, warranties, and benefits provided in this Contract are comparable to or better than the terms presently being offered by Vendor to any other governmental entity purchasing the same quantity under similar terms. If during the term of this Contract Vendor shall enter into non-GSA Schedule contracts with any other governmental entity providing greater benefits or more favorable terms than those provided by this Contract, Vendor shall be obligated to provide the same to Purchaser for subsequent purchases." | Please see Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements* for addressing exceptions to the Appenidx B *Proposed Contract.* |
| 91 | Identity was pointed out as a key adjacent workstream, yet 1.4.5 states that these will be awarded under a subsequent statement of work within the contract, yet these are not defined in 1.5.1. Can WaTech elaborate on these deliverables and the timeline expected? | CTS is only prepared to scope and schedule the deliverables defined in section 1.5.1 at this time. Additional deliverables will be scoped and scheduled in subsequent SOWs. |
| 92 | Does WaTech have a defined source of truth for all identities or is that part of the initial response? If so, then what is it? Which cloud platforms and on premises applications will this source of truth need to service? | Policies require agency user identities to be sourced from the Enterprise Active Directory managed by CTS. |
| 93 | We did not see in the report a prioritization for eliminating any regulatory gaps in the State’s identity strategy and cybersecurity. Does such a prioritization exist? | No, gaps identification and prioritization for identity and cybersecurity are not available at this time. |
| 94 | Was there an inventory of authentication/authorization methodology used that corresponds to the app inventory? | No, we do not have an inventory of authentication methodologies. |
| 95 | Is there an inventory of IT security and regulatory audits which WaTech are subject to that is available for us to review prior to responding? | No, an inventory of security and regulatory requirements is not available. |
| 96 | We are aware that the State of Washington consumes M365 licenses. Are there plans to leverage a GCC environment in order to streamline the regulatory requirements? | Given the scope of the Enterprise, CTS anticipates a breadth of environments and solutions will be leveraged to satisfy application needs, including government-specific environments. |
| 97 | [**Question Part 1**] How homogeneous are WaTech’s current MFA, SSO, SSPR solutions across all agencies?  [**Question Part 2**] Is it centrally managed or up to separate agencies? | The Enterprise has a variety of authentication mechanisms in use across agency applications. Some are centrally managed (e.g. M365 shared tenant MFA and Secure Access Washington MFA); others are distrubted and/or enabled via federation. |
| 98 | Is there an existing inventory of identity access management systems and identity governance systems that are currently in use that we can access in preparing our response? | No, an inventory of identity systems is not available. |
| 99 | Does WaTech have an existing information and data protection strategy already established and used by the agency service? | The State has a variety of policies and standards that establish information and data protection in use by agencies. Please see https://ocio.wa.gov/policies. |
| 100 | Is the bidder required to provide cost estimate for any cloud resources consumed during POC testing? Or will the state have existing cloud accounts that can be utilized? | Tools required to accomplish the work described in section 1.5.1 should be included in the bidder’s price. |
| 101 | Does the State have any requirements for US based personnel or US citizen only? | No, there is no requirement per se, but please see Section 1.4.8 |
| 102 | ​Does the State have a preference on the location of personnel supporting this project? Are there any onsite requirements? | Please see the answer to question #101 |
| 103 | Can the State confirm that initial migrations that occur before June 30, 2022 will be performed by other contractors and/or State agencies, and that the Cloud Center of Excellence is expected to provide oversight and management of those migrations only? | The initial SOW does not include application migration. Additional SOWs are anticipated under this procurement which may include migration activity and may be initiated prior to June 30, 2022. Bidders are not asked to provide a level of effort or include this work in Exhibit B, Section B capturing the deliverables for the initial SOW. |
| 104 | We know we cannot compete with the cloud companies for a lot of what is identified in the first phase but we do have one of the best processes for application mapping to identify applications that are ready to be served from the cloud and more importantly all of the interfaces that would need to be built to accommodate the move. Is it possible for us to respond to only the application mapping in the RFP and be considered? | No, this is a single award RFP. However, it is allowable for the ASV to sub-contract. |
| 105 | [Regarding RFP Amended, Table of Contents, page 2,] text in RFP links to Appendix F. Please advise where to find Appendix H, if applicable. | This was a test to see if Vendors read the RFP…just kidding. There is no Appendix H and this reference has been deleted in the amended RFP released with this amendment. |
| 106 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.3 Business Objective: Cloud Services Broker and Cloud Center of Excellence, Page 5,] creation of a Cloud Center of Excellence and Cloud Service Brokerage should not be limited to public cloud platforms when a private cloud solution is expected to exist in a client’s environment. Does WaTech intend to maintain a private cloud solution for consolidated hosting of those applications that may not be a good fit for Public Cloud? | Yes, CTS anticipates the existing private cloud shared service to remain part of the Enterprise portfolio. |
| 107 | [Regarding Unisys Statewide Cloud Computing Readiness Assessment, and r]egarding the 79 in-scope agencies, does the term “in-scope” mean participation is required? If not, what steps and processes will be put in place to confirm agency participation and impact to the design? | Nothing has been established at this point to require participation from any agency. |
| 108 | [Regarding RFP Section Appendix B,] can existing MSAs be used if a vendor already has one in place today? | An existing executory contract between CTS and Vendor may be the basis for previously negotiated terms. However, Vendors must still comply with Section 3.13 *Contract Requirements.* |
| 109 | [Regarding RPF Sections 1.5.1, last paragraph, and 1.6 Contract Usage,] can section A of Appendix E be updated to allow for cost of living escalations during the 6 option years? | Please refer to Section 4.4 of Appendix B *Proposed Contract.* |
| 110 | [Regarding RFP Section 1.5.1,] Section i indicates that the successful bidder will identify applications in the initial, priority wave of migrations, engaging with agencies to identify these first movers. Please confirm the number of agencies that bidders should anticipate to engage with. | The ECC will focus on Executive branch agencies excluding higher education: https://www.governor.wa.gov/boards-commissions/board-and-commissions/board-commission-profiles. The number of agencies identified as first movers is to be determined. |
| 111 | [**Question Part 1**] Can you please provide further details on the agencies vision on the pilot projects?  [**Question Part 2**] What would be the size of the pilot projects? | Pilots demonstrate capabilities and provide feedback. The size of the pilot projects is yet to be determined. |
| 112 | Please provide more information on “Enterprise Architecture design”, what is the responsibility of vendor here? | Enterprise Architecture design is identified as a primary CTS responsibility in the table within Section 1.5.2. Vendors are not asked drive this activity in the initial SOW. |